

Exhibit A

In re Delphi Corporation, et al., Case No. 05-44481 (RDD)

***Responses To The Debtors' Fourteenth Omnibus Claims Objection
Organized By Respondent¹***

	RESPONSE	PROOF OF CLAIM NOS.	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION OR PROPOSAL²	ORDER MODIFICATION (IF ANY)
1.	Takata Corporation (Docket No. 8268)	10968	Takata Corporation ("Takata") is a party to an executory contract (the "Contract") with Delphi Corporation and Delphi Technologies, Inc. ("Delphi Technologies"). Takata opposes the disallowance and expungement of proof of claim no. 10968. Takata asserts that its claim is based upon the Contract that has not been rejected, and was filed in an undetermined amount to preserve Takata's rights. Takata asserts that there is no basis to disallow the claim as duplicative because the agreement in question is an agreement with both Delphi Corporation and Delphi Technologies. Takata asserts that both Debtor entities have liability to Takata under the Contract, and because the cases have not been substantively consolidated, the claim is proper against both entities. Takata asserts that it is not seeking duplicate recovery.	Adjourn	None

¹ This chart reflects all Responses entered on the docket as of Friday, June 22, 2007 at 12:00 p.m. (prevailing Eastern time).

² This chart reflects all resolutions or proposals as of Friday, June 22, 2007 at 12:00 p.m. (prevailing Eastern time).

	RESPONSE	PROOF OF CLAIM NOS.	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION OR PROPOSAL ²	ORDER MODIFICATION (IF ANY)
2.	TK Holdings Inc., Automotive Systems Laboratory, Inc., and Takata Seat Belts Inc. (Docket No. 8267)	10571	TK Holdings Inc., Automotive Systems Laboratory, Inc., and Takata Seat Belts Inc. ("TK Holdings") oppose the disallowance and expungement of their proof of claim. TK Holdings asserts that its claim is based upon an executory contract that has not been rejected (the "Contract"), and was filed in an undetermined amount to preserve TK Holdings' rights. TK Holdings asserts that there is no basis to disallow the claim as duplicative because the Contract is an agreement with both Delphi Corporation and Delphi Technologies. TK Holdings asserts that each Debtor entity has liability to TK Holdings under the Contract, and because the cases have not been substantively consolidated, the claim is proper against both entities. TK Holdings asserts that it is not seeking duplicate recovery.	Adjourn	None
3.	NEC Electronics America, Inc. (Docket No. 8295)	12394	NEC Electronics America, Inc ("NEC") asserts that it does not seek multiple recoveries. NEC asserts that its original proof of claim (the "Original Claim") asserted a total claim of \$9,716,799.51 against Delphi Automotive Systems LLC ("DAS LLC") "and any other debtors that . . . have ordered, agreed to pay for or received any NEC Parts." The Original Claim was filed against multiple Debtors because purchase orders were issued to NEC under several names. On October 16, 2006, NEC filed an amended proof of claim (the "Amended Claim") increasing the amount of the claim. NEC asserts that an addendum to the Amended Claim indicated that it should be filed against multiple Debtors. NEC asserts that it will withdraw any duplicate claims as soon as it receives information to confirm which debtor is liable on its claim.	Adjourn	None

	RESPONSE	PROOF OF CLAIM NOS.	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION OR PROPOSAL ²	ORDER MODIFICATION (IF ANY)
4.	Contrarian Funds, LLC (Docket No. 8320)	16541	Contrarian Funds, LLC ("Contrarian") opposes the Debtors' request to expunge proof of claim no. 16541 (filed against DAS LLC) as duplicative of proof of claim no. 6321 (filed against Delphi Corporation). Contrarian asserts that the Debtors have provided no basis to reclassify the obligation in question from DAS LLC to Delphi Corporation. Contrarian also asserts that the relief requested in the Fourteenth Omnibus Claims Objection (the "Objection") should not be entered while Contrarian is in negotiations with the Debtors over the amount and proper Debtor with respect to proof of claim no. 6321, which was previously objected to in the Eleventh Omnibus Claims Objection.	Adjourn	None
5.	Johnson Controls, Inc. (Docket No. 8331)	15513	Johnson Controls, Inc. ("JCI") asserts that proof of claim no. 15513 is based upon potential breaches of contract arising under a sale, purchase and transfer agreement (the "Agreement"). JCI further asserts that although rejection of the Agreement would give rise to claims, there are additional ways that the Debtors could breach the Agreement to give rise to claims by JCI. JCI requests that the Objection be overruled.	Adjourn	None
6.	Johnson Controls, Inc. (Docket No. 8332)	15515	JCI asserts that proof of claim no. 15515 is based upon potential breaches of contract arising under a sale, purchase and transfer agreement (the "Agreement"). JCI further asserts that although rejection of the Agreement would give rise to claims, there are additional ways that the Debtors could breach the Agreement to give rise to claims by JCI. JCI requests that the Objection be overruled.	Adjourn	None

	RESPONSE	PROOF OF CLAIM NOS.	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION OR PROPOSAL ²	ORDER MODIFICATION (IF ANY)
7.	Johnson Controls, Inc. (Docket No. 8334)	15524	JCI asserts that proof of claim no. 15524 is based on potential breaches of contract arising under various prepetition purchase orders (the "Contracts") between JCI's Automotive Group and Delphi Corporation. JCI further asserts in addition to the rejection of the Contracts there are other ways that the Debtors could breach the Contracts to give rise to claims by JCI. JCI requests that the Objection be overruled.	Adjourn	None
8.	Johnson Controls, Inc. (Docket No. 8335)	15532	JCI asserts that proof of claim no. 15532 is based on potential breaches of contract arising under various prepetition purchase orders (the "Contracts") between JCI's Automotive Group and Delphi Mechatronic Systems, Inc. JCI further asserts in addition to the rejection of the Contracts there are other ways that the Debtors could breach the Contracts to give rise to claims by JCI. JCI requests that the Objection be overruled.	Adjourn	None
9.	JCI Technology Company (Docket No. 8341)	15519	JCI Technology Company ("JCI Tech.") asserts that proof of claim no. 15519 is based upon potential breaches of contract arising under a sale, purchase and transfer agreement (the "Agreement"). JCI Tech. further asserts that although rejection of the Agreement would give rise to claims, there are additional ways that the Debtors could breach the Agreement to give rise to claims by JCI Tech. JCI Tech. requests that the Objection be overruled.	Adjourn	None

	RESPONSE	PROOF OF CLAIM NOS.	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION OR PROPOSAL ²	ORDER MODIFICATION (IF ANY)
10.	JCI Technology Company (Docket No. 8342)	15520	JCI Tech. asserts that proof of claim no. 15520 is based upon potential breaches of contract arising under a interim trademark license agreement (the "Agreement"). JCI Tech. further asserts that although rejection of the Agreement would give rise to claims, there are additional ways that the Debtors could breach the Agreement to give rise to claims by JCI Tech. JCI Tech. requests that the Objection be overruled.	Adjourn	None
11.	JCI Technology Company (Docket No. 8343)	15521	JCI Tech. asserts that proof of claim no. 15521 is based upon potential breaches of contract arising under a sale, purchase, and transfer agreement, a trademark license agreement, an agreement regarding trademark licenses, and an interim trademark license agreement (the "Agreements"). JCI Tech. further asserts that rejection of the Agreements would give rise to claims, but that there are also other ways that the Debtors could breach the Agreements to give rise to claims by JCI Tech. JCI Tech. requests that the Objection be overruled.	Adjourn	None